

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/618,340 07/11/2003		Roland Albert	071308.0447	5245		
31625	7590	07/22/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BAKER BO		<del></del>	PANG, ROGER L			
PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3681			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_
1.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/618,340	ALBERT, ROLAND		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Roger L. Pang	3681		

Advisory Action	10/618,340	ALBERT, ROLAND				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Roger L. Pang	3681				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ess			
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 June 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API		•				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mont	hs of the date			
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	f the appeal.			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	·	•	,			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> </ol>	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ejected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	` ,			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or attac	hed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				
10. [_] Outer		12				
		Roger L Pang				
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3681				
		7-19-25				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

## **Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)**

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Adding new limitations in claim 2 provides a previously unsearched combination that would require further consideration.

With regard to applicant's arguments, applicant's main point of contention is that the plastic plate as taught by Loibl lacks hydraulic distribution. Thorum teaches the ECU located above a support plate, said plate having hydraulic fluid distributed through fluid channels. Thorum lacks the teaching of said support plate being made of plastic. Loible teaches an ECU located above a support plate that is made of plastic. The plastic plate also comprises of channels 12. The combination is not removing the hydraulic distribution plate of Thorum and adding the support plate of Loibl. The combination is using the material teaching of Loibl (plastic) and applying that to the support plate of Thorum. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.